

University of Groningen

Intergroup contact and ingroup reappraisal

Verkuyten, M.J.A.M.; Thijs, J.T.; Bekhuis, H.

Published in:
Social Psychology Quarterly

DOI:
[10.1177/0190272510389015](https://doi.org/10.1177/0190272510389015)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2010

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Verkuyten, M. J. A. M., Thijs, J. T., & Bekhuis, H. (2010). Intergroup contact and ingroup reappraisal: examining the deprovincialization thesis. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 73(4), 389-416.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0190272510389015>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Social Psychology Quarterly

<http://spq.sagepub.com/>

Intergroup Contact and Ingroup Reappraisal : Examining the Deprovincialization Thesis

Maykel Verkuyten, Jochem Thijs and Hidde Bekhuis
Social Psychology Quarterly 2010 73: 398
DOI: 10.1177/0190272510389015

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://spq.sagepub.com/content/73/4/398>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



American Sociological Association

Additional services and information for *Social Psychology Quarterly* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://spq.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://spq.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Dec 13, 2010

[What is This?](#)

Intergroup Contact and Ingroup Reappraisal: Examining the Deprovincialization Thesis

MAYKEL VERKUYTEN
JOCHEM THIJSS
HIDDE BEKHUIS

Ercomer, Utrecht University, The Netherlands

According to the deprovincialization thesis, interethnic contact involves a reappraisal and distancing from the ingroup. Contact can broaden one's horizon by acknowledging and recognizing the value of other cultures and thereby putting the taken-for-granted own cultural standards into perspective. The current research uses data from three surveys to examine the relationship between quantity of outgroup contact and ingroup distance (ingroup identification and ingroup feelings) among native Dutch participants. More positive contact with ethnic outgroups was expected to lead to a higher endorsement of multiculturalism, that, in turn, is related to a stronger distancing from the ingroup. Findings in all three studies support the deprovincialization thesis. In addition, in Study 3, mediation is found independently of outgroup threat. Findings across the three studies confirm the stability of the results and cross-validate the deprovincialization thesis.

Keywords: deprovincialization, outgroup contact, multiculturalism

Interviewer: "Is that right, you think it is enriching too, these, er, different cultures?"

Interviewee: "Oh absolutely. You get this wider perspective. You don't just—this conventional, narrow Holland and er all that er you get a wider perspective you know, you, you start taking more of an interest in other cultures too."

"In-group norms, customs, and lifestyles turn out not to be the only ways to manage the social world. The new perspective not only individualizes and "humanizes" outgroup members but serves to distance you from your ingroup. . . . Those with outgroup friends gain distance from their own group

and form a less provincial perspective on other groups in general."

The first quote is from research on multiculturalism in the Netherlands (Verkuyten 2004) and illustrates the proposition of "deprovincialization." The subject believes that through intergroup contact you can "get this wider perspective," a self-critical view that goes beyond "this conventional, narrow Holland." The second quote is from Pettigrew (1997:174) who introduced the concept of deprovincialization and argued that intergroup contact not only affects attitudes toward outgroups but also involves a reappraisal and distancing from the ingroup (see also Pettigrew 1998). Especially for majority group members, contact can lead to the insight that the traditions, customs, norms, and values of one's group are not the only ways to manage and look at the world. Relative to members of ethnic minorities, majority group members are generally less inclined to reflect on their

Direct correspondence to Maykel Verkuyten, Ercomer, Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Utrecht University, Heidelberglaan 2, 3584 CS, Utrecht, The Netherlands; M.Verkuyten@uu.nl.

privileged culture and status or to think about themselves in terms of their group membership (Verkuyten 2005). Contacts with ethnic outgroups may broaden people's horizon by acknowledging and recognizing the value of other cultures and thereby putting their taken-for-granted own cultural standards into perspective.

Ethnocentrism refers to judging other groups from one's own cultural point of view (LeVine and Campbell 1972). Limited experiences provide the view that the ingroup is the center of the world and its norms and customs provide the self-evident and invariant standards for judgment. Intergroup contact can enrich people's views of the social world making them use less ingroup-centric and more pluralistic standards of judgment. As a principle, multiculturalism emphasizes equality between and respect for the pluralism of cultures and group identities. Multicultural approaches involve learning about differences and diversity and imply that one's own cultural standards are considered more relative (e.g., Fowers and Richardson 1996; Nagda, Kim, and Truelove 2004). The current research examines in three large-scale surveys the relationship between quantity of outgroup contact and ingroup distance among native Dutch participants. The proposition tested is that multicultural recognition mediates this relationship. More frequent (voluntary) contact with ethnic outgroups is expected to lead to a higher endorsement of multiculturalism, that, in turn, is related to a stronger distancing from one's ingroup. Ingroup distance is examined in terms of ingroup identification and feelings toward the ingroup.

INTERGROUP CONTACT

Numerous studies among different age groups have examined the relationship between intergroup contact and outgroup prejudice (see Brown and Hewstone 2005; Pettigrew and Tropp 2006; Tropp and Preno-vost 2008). These studies typically find that contact reduces prejudice and facilitating conditions for this effect have been identified and examined. This positive effect of contact

is not only found for the quality of the contact but also for quantity of contact (e.g., Brown et al. 2007; Tausch et al. 2007; Velasco González et al. 2008; Ward and Masgoret 2006) and for contact opportunities (Hallinan and Smith 1985; Wagner et al. 2003). Frequent intergroup contact can enhance knowledge, reduce fear and anxiety, and increase empathy and perspective taking (Eller and Abrams 2004; Pettigrew and Tropp 2008). Learning new information can correct negative views of the outgroup and reduce uncertainty about how to interact with others. It can also lead to increased cultural sensitivity and perspective taking, and a reappraisal of the ingroup.

The importance of learning new information is considered a critical component of, for example, multicultural education. This learning typically implies a reshaping of the views on one's ingroup (Hogan and Mallott 2005; Nagda et al. 2004). New information and experiences facilitate the view that the ingroup is no longer the center of the world and those ingroup norms and customs are reappraised. Pettigrew (1998) discusses the results of European surveys showing that outgroup friendship was related to less national pride among majority group members. In another study, using a German national probability sample, he showed that positive contact was negatively associated with the strength of German identity (Pettigrew 2009). These findings suggest that intergroup contact can lead to less provincialism or a distancing from the ingroup (but see Eller and Abrams 2004). However, these studies did not examine mediating processes and it is not clear whether frequency of contact has similar effects. Our research focused on the endorsement of multicultural recognition as the mediating factor between contact frequency and ingroup distance.

MULTICULTURAL RECOGNITION

In their Unified Instrumental Model of Group Conflict, Esses and colleagues (Esses et al. 2005) argue for the importance of ideological factors that can heighten sensitivity to ingroups and outgroups. The endorsement of

a multicultural ideology, such as the general view that cultural diversity is good for society, is a key ideological aspect in the context of immigrants and minority cultures (Verkuyten 2006). The multiculturalism hypothesis proposes that the endorsement of cultural diversity leads to higher levels of acceptance toward ethnic outgroups. Some experimental studies have indeed shown a causal positive effect of multiculturalism on automatic and explicit forms of racial and ethnic attitudes (e.g., Richeson and Nussbaum 2004; Verkuyten 2005; Wolsko et al. 2000). Furthermore, in contrast to assimilationist thinking which provides intellectual and moral justification for the superiority and unchanging character of the dominant group (Fredrickson 1999), multiculturalism is an ideological view that emphasizes nuance and puts into perspective the majority's group identity and culture (Fowers and Richardson 1996). Some evidence for this comes from four studies among ethnic Dutch participants (Verkuyten 2005). In two survey studies, there was a tendency for the endorsement of multiculturalism to be negatively associated with ingroup evaluation. In addition, the other two were experimental studies where Dutch participants tended to have lower ingroup evaluation in a multicultural compared to an assimilationist situational context.

Intergroup contact provides insights about outgroups as well as the ingroup. Through positive contact people can gain greater knowledge and understanding about cultural differences and the value of diversity. In the context of New Zealand, Ward and Masgoret (2006) found a positive association between intergroup contact and the endorsement of multicultural ideology. In a study among Dutch participants a similar association was found (Velasco González et al. 2008). Thus, we predicted intergroup contact to be positively associated with the endorsement of multicultural recognition.

In turn, stronger endorsement of multiculturalism should be associated with more distance from the ingroup. Distancing from the ingroup typically implies lower ingroup identification and less positive feelings toward the

ingroup (Guimond, Dif, and Aupy 2002; Verkuyten and Reijerse 2008). We expected stronger endorsement of multicultural ideology to be associated with lower ingroup identification and less positive ingroup feelings. Most importantly, the endorsement of multiculturalism was expected to mediate the relationship between intergroup contact and ingroup distance. Intergroup contact involves a reappraisal of the ingroup by offering information and knowledge that puts one's own lifestyles, customs, and norms into the perspective of the value of cultural diversity.

OUTGROUP THREAT

Various studies have demonstrated that positive intergroup contact reduces intergroup threat and anxiety (e.g., Tausch et al. 2007; Voci and Hewstone 2003) and quantity of contact can have a similar effect (e.g., Eller and Abrams 2004; Velasco González et al. 2008). Furthermore, the endorsement of multiculturalism is negatively related to feelings of outgroup threat (Velasco González et al. 2008; Ward and Masgoret 2006). The "group identity reaction" model (Eccleston and Major 2006) postulates that perceiving group threat leads individuals to identify more strongly with their ingroup and to evaluate their ingroup more positively. People can cope with outgroup threats by adopting group-based strategies that increase ingroup identification and positive ingroup feelings (Jetten et al. 2001; Schmitt and Branscombe 2002). Further, because intergroup contact tends to reduce feelings of outgroup threat, it might be that threat mediates the relationship between contact and ingroup distance, rather than the endorsement of multiculturalism. Therefore, Study 3 examines the possibility that intergroup contact does not lead to ingroup distance by endorsing the value of cultural diversity but through reduced feelings of intergroup threat.

STUDY FORMAT

The deprovincialization thesis proposes that intergroup contact broadens cultural horizons of majority members by putting their

taken-for-granted cultural standards into perspective and distancing them from their ingroup. We analyzed three surveys to test this proposition among native Dutch school pupils as members of the majority group. Study 1 focuses on opportunities for intergroup contact by examining the effect of the proportion of ethnic minority classmates on preadolescents endorsement of multiculturalism and ingroup distance. In addition, we statistically controlled for the perception of the normative classroom climate. We expected contact opportunity to have a positive effect on the endorsement of multiculturalism, and, via multiculturalism, on ingroup distance.

Study 2 was conducted among an older group of adolescents and had a similar design as Study 1. However, Study 2 did not only focus on contact opportunities but also included direct measures of quantity of intergroup contact. Study 3 goes beyond the second study by not only focusing on multiculturalism but also on feelings of outgroup threat as an alternative mediator between quantity of contact and ingroup distance. We examined whether multiculturalism plays a mediating role, independent of feelings of threat.

All three studies are correlational, which raises questions of causality. For some relationships, the causal direction is rather self-evident. For example, a correlation exists between the objective number of ethnic minority classmates and the endorsement of multiculturalism. In other expected relations, the causal sequence is less certain. For example, valuing cultural diversity might stimulate an interest in intergroup contact (Tropp and Bianchi 2006). Therefore, we will examine the statistical fit of alternative models. The hypotheses were tested using multilevel analysis and structural equation modelling.

STUDY 1

Research has shown a positive correlation between the number of ethnic minority members in the classroom and intergroup friendliness (Hallinan and Smith 1985, 1989). The first study focuses on the proportion of ethnic

minority classmates as an indicator of intergroup contact opportunity. The endorsement of multiculturalism is the proposed mediating variable and ingroup identification and global feelings towards the ingroup serve as indicators of ingroup distance. In addition, because the expected relationships might be due to the normative classroom climate we statistically controlled for children's perceptions of the endorsement of multiculturalism by their classmates.

Method: Sample

The analysis focuses on 743 pre-adolescents ($M_{\text{age}} = 10.93$ years, $SD = 0.77$; 46.2 percent female) from 48 school classes in a medium-sized town in the west of the Netherlands. All these students attended either grade 5 or 6. They self-identified as native Dutch and indicated that both of their parents were born in the Netherlands. In the Netherlands, parental birthplace is the main indicator of ethnicity and ethnic minority youth self-identities, for example, as Turkish, Moroccan, and Surinamese (Verkuyten 2005). The participants completed a short questionnaire in their classrooms. Participation was voluntary and anonymity was guaranteed. All preadolescents agreed to participate.

Method: Measures

Contact opportunity was operationalized as the proportion of students in each participant's classroom that did not self-identify as native Dutch. To obtain this information all students in the classroom were asked to report on their own ethnicity.

The endorsement of multiculturalism was assessed with five items taken from Berry and Kalin's (1995) Multicultural Ideology Scale. These items have been used in previous research in the Netherlands, including research among preadolescents (Arends-Tóth and Van de Vijver 2003; Verkuyten and Thijs 2010). Considering the age group, the items were formulated in relation to the "Turks and Moroccans" who are the numerically largest and most prototypical minority groups in the Netherlands. Two sample items are:

"Turks and Moroccans should be allowed to maintain their own traditions and culture in the Netherlands" and "the Dutch should have more respect for the culture of the Turks and Moroccans." Response scales ranged from 1 = completely disagree to 5 = completely agree. Cronbach's alpha was 0.78.

Ethnic ingroup feelings were measured with a feeling thermometer running from 0 degrees = very negative feelings to 100 degrees = very positive feelings. Students were instructed that 50 degrees represents neutral feelings, markings above 50 degrees indicate positive or warm feelings, and markings below 50 degrees indicate cold or negative feelings. The thermometer has been used as a global measure of group feelings in many studies including studies among preadolescents (e.g., Verkuyten 2005; Verkuyten and Thijs 2010; Wolsko et al. 2006).

Ethnic ingroup identification was assessed with two items ("How important is it to you that you are Dutch?" and "Are you proud to be Dutch?") for which Cronbach's alpha was 0.76. Response scales ranged from 1 = no, not at all to 5 = yes, certainly.

Perceived normative classroom climate (the covariate in this study) was assessed with three items. On a five-point scale ranging from almost none to almost all, students were asked to estimate the number of classmates who were a) in favor of respect for all cultures, b) opposed to discrimination, and c) consider all cultures to be equal; alpha was 0.78.

Data Analysis

The data had a three-level structure with students ($n = 743$; Level 1) nested within classes ($n = 48$; Level 2) that were nested within schools ($n = 48$; Level 3). Therefore multilevel analysis was performed. Multilevel analysis corrects for dependencies between observations nested within the same units (e.g., classes) and can be used to test the impact of variables at higher levels (e.g., classroom contact opportunities, Level 2) on lower-level variables (e.g., students' endorsement of multiculturalism, Level 1). We tested

multilevel regression models with MLwiN version 2.0 (Rasbash et al. 2004) using the Iterative Generalized Least Squares algorithm. In MLwiN 2.0 multivariate models can be specified by including an additional level (Level 0) representing the different dependent variables nested within individual respondents (Level 1; see Goldstein 1995; Snijders and Bosker 1999). Hence, we can simultaneously examine ingroup feelings and ingroup identification as two aspects of ingroup distance, and examine whether both measures are similarly affected by the independent variables.¹ Model improvement was assessed by comparing the fit (deviance) of nested models. Differences between these statistics follow a Chi-square distribution with degrees of freedom given by the difference in parameters (Snijders and Bosker 1999).

Results: Mean Scores and Intercorrelations

Table 1 shows the means and intercorrelations for all variables. On average, all participants visited classrooms with a moderate proportion of non-native Dutch students indicating contact opportunities, and their support for multiculturalism was around the midpoint of the scale. The general feeling toward the ingroup was positive and significantly above the midpoint of the scale, $t(742) = 52.11$, $p < .01$. The score for ingroup identification was also relatively high. Ingroup feelings and identification were moderately associated, warranting their simultaneous examination as two aspects of ingroup distance.

¹ The multivariate multilevel model is an elaboration of the univariate multilevel model. An univariate two-level regression model with one fixed Level 1 predictor x can be expressed by $y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{ij} + e_{ij} + u_j$, with $\text{var}(e_{ij}) = \sigma_e^2$ and $\text{var}(u_j) = \sigma_u^2$. Here, the subscripts i and j denote units at, respectively, Level 1 (e.g., student) and Level 2 (e.g., classroom), β_0 is the intercept and β_1 is the slope, and e_{ij} and u_j are the residuals for each level. The two-variate version of the univariate model is represented by $y_{hij} = \beta_{01}z_{1hij} + \beta_{02}z_{2hij} + \beta_{11}z_{1hij}x_i + \beta_{12}z_{2hij}x_i + e_{1ij}z_{1hij} + e_{2ij}z_{2hij} + u_{1j}z_{1hij} + u_{2j}z_{2hij}$, with $\text{var}(e_{1ij}) = \sigma_{e1}^2$, $\text{var}(e_{2ij}) = \sigma_{e2}^2$, $\text{cov}(e_{1ij} e_{2ij}) = \sigma_{e1e2}$, $\text{var}(u_{1j}) = \sigma_{u1}^2$, $\text{var}(u_{2j}) = \sigma_{u2}^2$, and $\text{cov}(u_{1j} u_{2j}) = \sigma_{u1u2}$. In this equation, the additional level (Level 0) is indicated by the subscript h . Also, $z_{1ij} = 1$ and 0 for, respectively, the first and the second dependent variable, and $z_{2ij} = 1 - z_{1ij}$ (see Goldstein 1995).

Table 1. Intercorrelations, Means, and Standard Deviations in Study 1

	1	2	3	4	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Contact Opportunity					0.21	0.16
2. Classroom Climate	0.04				3.68	1.16
3. Multiculturalism	0.16**	0.28**			3.16	0.92
4. Ingroup Feelings	0.06	-0.09*	-0.13**		85.17	18.40
5. Ingroup Identification	0.04	-0.16**	-0.28**	0.26**	3.48	3.48

Notes. The scales for classroom climate, multiculturalism, and ingroup identification range from 1 to 5. Contact opportunity is a proportion measure, and the scale for ingroup feelings ranges from 1 to 100.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Results: Variance Components

Prior to testing our hypotheses, we estimated the variance components of multiculturalism and ingroup distance (ingroup feelings and identification) at each level. For this, so-called intercept-only regression models were specified (Snijders and Bosker 1999). Initial results showed that model fit did not worsen significantly ($p > .05$) when Level 3 was not included in the analyses. Hence, we further analyzed the less complex two-level models. For multiculturalism, 13.8 percent of the variance was at Level 2, and for ingroup feelings and evaluations these percentages were, respectively, 2.8 percent and 4.1 percent. This indicates that classmates were relatively similar with respect to ingroup distance and especially so with respect to multiculturalism.

Results: Ingroup Distance

To examine the unique contributions of contact opportunity on multiculturalism and ingroup feeling and ingroup identification, two multilevel regression models were tested. Results are shown in Table 2 (Models 1 and 2). In the first model, multiculturalism was regressed on both contact opportunity and perceived normative classroom climate (the control variable). It appeared that students with more contact opportunity reported more endorsement of multiculturalism, independently of the perceived classroom norm.

Next, we examined the impact of contact opportunity on ingroup distance, i.e., ingroup feelings and ingroup identification, using

normative classroom climate as a control. Unexpectedly, there were no unique effects of contact opportunity (see Model 2). This finding seems to preclude the possibility of mediation (Baron and Kenny 1986), which requires a significant relation between the independent variable (contact opportunity) and the dependent variable (ingroup distance).

In the third model, multiculturalism was entered as an additional predictor of the two aspects of ingroup distance. As expected, this measure had a negative effect on both aspects, and, as indicated by the superscripts in Table 2, the effect was stronger for identification than for ingroup feelings.² Furthermore, adding multiculturalism to the equation revealed unique, positive effects of contact opportunity. This pattern of findings indicates a (reciprocal) suppression effect (see Lancaster 1999). To examine the indirect effects of contact opportunity on ingroup distance via the endorsement of multiculturalism, two Sobel tests were performed (MacKinnon, Warsi, and Dwyer 1995). Results indicated that these indirect effects were significant for both ingroup feelings and for ingroup identification, respectively, $z = -2.53$, $p < .05$, and $z = -3.36$, $p < .01$.

Together, these results show that there are two opposite effects of contact opportunity on ingroup distance and that these effects cancel

² In a multivariate multilevel analysis, differences between two effects can be tested by comparing the fit of a model with two separate coefficients to the fit of a model with one common coefficient.

Table 2. Multilevel Regression Models for the Prediction of Multiculturalism and Ingroup Distance in Study 1

	Model 1 Multi-culturalism	Model 2		Model 3	
		Ingroup Feelings	Ingroup Identification	Ingroup Feelings	Ingroup Identification
Contact Opportunity	0.17**	0.06 ^a	0.05 ^a	0.08* ^a	0.09* ^a
Classroom Climate	0.24**	-0.08* ^a	-0.15** ^a	-0.05 ^a	-0.08* ^a
Multiculturalism	—	—	—	-0.13** ^a	-0.27** ^b
<i>Variance</i>					
Level 1 (percent explained)	0.83 (4.7 percent)	0.97 (0.2 percent)	0.95 (1.0 percent)	0.96 (1.3 percent)	0.90 (6.5 percent)
Level 2 (percent explained)	0.07 (50.0 percent)	0.02 (35.7 percent)	0.02 (43.9 percent)	0.01 (53.6 percent)	0.01 (80.5 percent)
Deviance	2007.28	4134.97		4082.48	
<i>Model improvement</i>					
χ^2 (df)	53.74 (2)**	18.19 (4)**		52.50 (2)**	
Reference model	Intercept-only	Intercept-only		Model 2	

Notes. Regression coefficients are *bs* but all variables are standardized (*z*-scores) at Level 1. For each row in the same model, effects with similar superscripts are similar at $p > .05$, and effects with different superscripts are different at $p < .01$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

each other out. As expected from our theoretical reasoning, contact opportunity resulted in higher ingroup distance because it leads to a stronger endorsement of multiculturalism. Yet at the same time, contact opportunity also had a direct effect leading to higher ingroup identification and more positive ingroup feelings.

Results: Alternative Mediation

We also conducted a set of analyses in which an alternative mediation model was examined. In this model, ingroup feelings and ingroup identification are expected to mediate the effect of contact opportunity on the endorsement of multiculturalism. The indirect effects were not significant ($p > .15$) indicating that ingroup distance did not mediate the influence of contact opportunity on multiculturalism.

Discussion

The multilevel results of Study 1 support the deprovincialization proposition. Contact opportunity appears to lead to higher ingroup distance via its association with increased endorsement of multiculturalism.

Pre-adolescents who have more opportunities for contact with ethnic outgroup classmates tend to endorse the value of cultural diversity more strongly; this endorsement is associated with lower ingroup identification and less positive ingroup feelings. This finding is not due to the perceived classroom climate about the normative acceptance of cultural diversity. Furthermore, there was no evidence that ingroup distance mediated the influence of contact opportunity on multiculturalism. Additionally, the focus on contact opportunity implies that the findings are difficult to explain by reversed causality in which the endorsement of multiculturalism or ingroup distancing leads to more intergroup contact opportunities at school.

However, contact opportunity in school is a proxy for actual intergroup contact and higher opportunity for interethnic contact was also directly related to less ingroup distance. This finding suggests that a higher proportion of ethnic minority classmates can challenge and threaten the position and identity of the native majority group (Blalock 1967). Identity threat can lead individuals to identify more strongly with their ingroup and to evaluate their ingroup more positively.

People can cope with outgroup threats by adopting group-based strategies that increase ingroup orientation (Jetten et al. 2001; Schmitt and Branscombe 2002).

STUDY 2

We conducted a second study to examine whether these findings could be generalized to another and older sample of adolescents. In so doing, we focused not only on contact opportunities but also on the quantity of intergroup contact. According to the deprovincialization thesis, having frequent contact with ethnic outgroup members should lead to a stronger endorsement of multiculturalism and thereby to a distancing away from the ingroup. Through frequent contact, people can acquire a less provincial perspective that serves to distance them from their ingroup. Thus, we expected quantity of intergroup contact to be related to more ingroup distance due to its association with multiculturalism. In Study 2, ingroup distance was assessed with ingroup identification and feelings toward specific ingroup members rather than global feelings. We, again, controlled statistically for perceived normative classroom climate.

Method: Participants

The analysis focused on 1028 students ($M_{\text{age}} = 15.86$, $SD = 0.62$; 46.8 percent female) from 77 classes in 10 schools in a medium-sized town in the east of the Netherlands. All participants indicated that both of their parents were Dutch by birth. Participants completed a questionnaire in their classrooms. Participation was voluntary and anonymity was guaranteed, and all adolescents agreed to participate.

Method: Measures

Contact opportunity was based upon the relative proportion of students in each classroom who indicated that at least one of their parents was not born in the Netherlands. This measure was somewhat different from the one used in Study 1, which pertained to

students' own ethnicity. Yet that study demonstrated a very strong correlation ($r = .97$) between the proportion of non self-defined Dutch students and the proportion of students with at least one non-Dutch parent.

The endorsement of multiculturalism was measured with six items (five-point scales) taken again from the Multicultural Ideology Scale (Berry and Kalin 1995). Cronbach's alpha was 0.82.

Ingroup feelings were assessed by asking participants to rate their affective reactions toward "a new ethnic Dutch classmate" and "a new ethnic Dutch neighbor." The response scale ranged from 1 = very negative to 5 = very positive. Cronbach's alpha was 0.65.

Three items were used to measure ingroup identification. These items were taken from previous studies in the Netherlands (see Verkuyten 2005) and measure the importance attached to one's ethnic group membership (e.g., "Being Dutch is an important part of myself"). The response scale ranged from 1 = completely disagree to 7 = completely agree, and Cronbach's alpha was 0.67.

Quantity of contact was measured with 10 items about the frequency of having lunch and cooperating in the classroom with fellow students of, respectively, Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese, Antilleans, and other ethnic minority backgrounds. Response scales varied from 1 = never to 4 = often. Cronbach's alpha for these ten questions was 0.85.

Perceived normative classroom climate was, again, included as a covariate in the analysis. Two questions were asked: "Are racism and discrimination discussed in class?" and "Are the customs and habits of people from foreign cultures discussed in class?" The same four-point response format as for quantity of contact was used and Cronbach's alpha was 0.65

Results: Mean scores and Intercorrelations

Means and intercorrelations of all variables are shown in Table 3. The participants attended classes with relatively few interethnic contact opportunities, i.e., few students

Table 3. Intercorrelations, Means, and Standard Deviations in Study 2

	1	2	3	4	5	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Contact Opportunity						0.06	0.09
2. Contact	0.40**					1.61	0.63
3. Classroom Climate	0.04	0.10**				2.52	0.63
4. Multiculturalism	-0.03	0.13**	0.06			2.89	0.77
5. Ingroup Feelings	0.01	-0.03	0.03	-0.19**		4.02	0.63
6. Ingroup Identification	-0.01	-0.07*	-0.02	-0.39**	0.28**	6.08	0.98

Notes. The scales for multiculturalism and ingroup feelings range from 1 to 5, the scales for contact and classroom climate range from 1 to 4, and the scale for ingroup identification ranges from 1 to 7. Contact opportunity is a proportion measure.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

with at least one non-Dutch parent.³ However, these opportunities were substantially and positively related to self-reported (voluntary) contact with ethnic minorities. Students' endorsement of multiculturalism was around the midpoint of the scale. Ingroup feelings and ingroup identification were positive, and the mean score of the former measure was above the neutral midpoint of the scale, $t(1027) = 51.92$, $p < .01$. Moreover, similar to Study 1, ingroup feelings and identification were positively but not very strongly related.

Results: Variance Components

Two intercept-only models were tested to examine the variance components of multiculturalism and ingroup distance at the different levels (Snijders and Bosker 1999). As the three-level models had better fit than the two-level models ($p < .05$), the former were further analyzed. For multiculturalism 83.1 percent of the variance was at Level 1, 6.6 percent at Level 2, and 10.3 percent at Level 3. For ingroup feelings these percentages were 92.1, 5.9, and 2.0, respectively, and for ingroup identification, 87.8, 7.9, and 4.2. Although most of the variance in these measures existed between students attending the same classroom, there were also differences between classrooms and between schools.

Results: Ingroup Distance

As in Study 1, we tested three different multilevel regression models which are shown in Table 3. In the first two models, multiculturalism and the two aspects of ingroup distance were regressed on both contact opportunity and quantity of self-reported contact, controlling statistically for perceived normative classroom climate. As expected, self-reported contact had a positive effect on multiculturalism and was associated with more ingroup distance. The latter effect was stronger for ingroup identification than for ingroup feelings. In addition, contact opportunity had no independent effects on multiculturalism and ingroup distance.⁴

In the third model, we examined whether multiculturalism mediates the effect of self-reported contact on ingroup distance. According to Baron and Kenny (1986), the critical test for mediation is that the link between the independent variable (outgroup contact) and the dependent variable (ingroup distance) must be significantly reduced when the mediator variable (multiculturalism) is controlled for. To conduct this test, we included multiculturalism as an additional predictor of ingroup distance (Table 4, Model 3). As expected, multiculturalism was associated with less positive ingroup

³ The measure for contact opportunity in this study had high skewness and kurtosis. However, analyses with the same measure after arcsin transformation yielded virtually the same results.

⁴ However, contact opportunity did have a positive indirect effect on multiculturalism through actual contact ($z = 4.96$, $p < .01$), and a negative indirect effect on ingroup feelings ($z = -1.95$, $p = .05$) and on ingroup identification ($z = -3.23$, $p < .01$).

Table 4. Multilevel Regression Models for the Prediction of Multiculturalism and Ingroup Distance in Study 2

	Model 1	Model 2		Model 3	
	Multi-culturalism	Ingroup Feelings	Ingroup Identification	Ingroup Feelings	Ingroup Identification
Contact Opportunity	-0.06	0.01 ^a	-0.01 ^a	0.00 ^a	-0.03 ^a
Contact	0.23**	-0.07** ^a	-0.12** ^a	-0.03 ^a	-0.04 ^a
Classroom Climate	0.02	0.05 ^a	-0.01 ^a	0.05 ^a	-0.01 ^a
Multiculturalism	—	—	—	-0.017** ^a	-0.36** ^b
<i>Variance</i>					
Level 1 (percent explained)	0.81 (5.2 percent)	0.92 (0.8 percent)	0.88 (2.0 percent)	0.92 (1.3 percent)	0.79 (11.9 percent)
Level 2 (percent explained)	0.07 (—)	0.06 (—)	0.09 (—)	0.05 (21.7 percent)	0.05 (37.0 percent)
Level 3 (percent explained)	0.13 (—)	0.03 (—)	0.06 (—)	0.000 (100 percent)	0.03 (32.6 percent)
Deviance	2779.85	5675.52	5541.99		
<i>Model improvement</i>					
χ^2 (df)	48.75 (3)**	17.65 (6)**	133.52 (2)**		
Reference model	Intercept-only	Intercept-only		Model 2	

Notes. Regression coefficients are *bs* but all variables are standardized (*z*-scores) at Level 1. For each row in the same model, effects with similar superscripts are similar at $p > .05$, and effects with different superscripts are different at $p < .01$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

feelings and, particularly, with lower ingroup identification. Furthermore, in the analysis including multiculturalism, the effect of out-group contact on ingroup distance was no longer significant. The Sobel test for mediation confirmed that the mediational paths were reliably greater than zero, respectively, $z = -4.25$, $p < .001$, for ingroup feeling, and $z = -6.07$, $p < .01$, for ingroup identification.

Results: Alternative Mediation

We examined whether there is evidence for alternative mediation by investigating two sets of indirect effects. First, we tested whether ingroup feelings and group identification mediate the effect of self-reported contact on the endorsement of multiculturalism. The indirect effect was not significant for ingroup feelings ($p > .10$), but significant for identification ($p < .01$). However, the size of the latter effect ($z = -3.46$) was smaller than for the mediation in the deprovincialization model (see above).

Second, we investigated whether self-reported contact mediated the relationship

between multiculturalism and ingroup distance. These effects were not significant for ingroup feelings and for identification ($p_s > .25$).

Discussion

Although other measures were used, the results of the second study are quite similar to those of the first. They go beyond the first study by focusing on frequency of self-reported contact in addition to contact opportunity. Controlling statistically for normative classroom climate and opportunity for contact, self-reported contact was associated with lower ingroup identification and less positive ingroup feelings. Furthermore, the effect of contact on ingroup distance was fully mediated by the endorsement of multiculturalism. There was no clear empirical evidence for alternative mediation models. These findings support the deprovincialization proposition.

STUDY 3

In Study 3, we examined whether the findings generalize to another sample and we

focused on outgroup threat in addition to the endorsement of multiculturalism. Deprovincialization implies that ingroup norms, beliefs, and customs are put into perspective. The new perspective “serves to distance you from your ingroup” (Pettigrew 1997: 174). The focus is on knowledge and learning that would lead to a less ingroup-centric worldview. However, it is also possible that intergroup contact does not lead to ingroup distance via the endorsement of the value of cultural diversity, but rather through reduced feelings of intergroup threat. Intergroup contact is related to the endorsement of multiculturalism (Velasco González et al. 2008; Ward and Masgoret 2006) and tends to reduce feelings of outgroup threat (e.g., Tausch et al. 2007; Voci and Hewstone 2003). It may be that threat, rather than the endorsement of multiculturalism, mediates the relationship between contact and ingroup distance.

In examining this alternative explanation we focused on contact with Muslim peers. In public debates, Islam and Muslims are typically presented and perceived as threatening to Dutch society (Scroggins 2005). Leading politicians have taken a fiercely negative position on Islam, defining it as a backward religion that seriously threatens Dutch national identity and culture (see Verkuyten and Zaremba 2005). In 2005, the Pew Global Project found that 51 percent of the Dutch participants had unfavorable opinions about Muslims and a similar percentage has been found in studies among adolescents (e.g., Velasco Gonzalez et al. 2008).

Method: Participants

A questionnaire was distributed in three secondary schools located in the south of the country. Based on their self-reported ethnicity, there was a sample of 595 native Dutch, non-Muslim adolescents ($M_{\text{age}} = 15.06$, $SD = 0.99$; 47 percent female). Students completed the questionnaire in their classrooms and all students agreed to participate.

Method: Measures

Intergroup contact was measured with two items used in a previous study (Velasco

Gonzalez et al. 2008): “Do you have contact with Muslim students at school?” and “Do you have contact with Muslims in your neighborhood?” The items were rated on four-point scales, ranging from 1 = never to 4 = often. Cronbach’s alpha is 0.63. Higher scores indicate greater levels of intergroup contact.

The endorsement of multiculturalism was measured with six items (five-point scales) that were similar to the items used in Study 2. Cronbach’s alpha is 0.79 and a higher score indicates a stronger endorsement of multiculturalism.

Outgroup threat was measured using six items (five-point scales) that were similar to the scales used by Stephan and colleagues in testing their integrated threat theory (1998, 1999). Sample items include: “Because of the presence of Muslims, Dutch people have more difficulties in finding a job”; “Because of the presence of Muslims, Dutch people have more difficulties in finding a house”; “I am afraid of increasing violence and vandalism in the Netherlands because of Muslims”; and “I am afraid of violent attacks by Muslims in the Netherlands.” Higher scores indicate stronger feelings of threat and Cronbach’s alpha for this scale is 0.83.

Ingroup identification was assessed by asking the participants to respond to six items (five-point scales) that were taken from previous Dutch research (Verkuyten 2005). The items were similar to the items used in the first two studies (e.g., “It is important to me to be Dutch”). Cronbach’s alpha for the six-item scale is 0.89.

Similar to Study 1, ingroup feelings were assessed by means of the “feeling thermometer.” In the instruction it was explained again that 50 degrees represents neutral feelings, markings above 50 degrees indicate positive or warm feelings, and markings below 50 degrees indicate cold or negative feelings.

Results: Mean Scores and Intercorrelations

As shown in Table 5, participants had, on average, relatively low levels of outgroup

Table 5. Intercorrelations, Means, and Standard Deviations in Study 3

	1	2	3	4	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Contact					2.08	0.74
2. Threat	-0.27**				2.91	0.86
3. Multiculturalism	0.34**	-0.53**			2.66	0.72
4. Ingroup Feelings	-0.18**	0.25**	-0.27**		83.62	17.06
5. Ingroup Identification	-0.22**	0.35**	-0.36**	0.34**	3.44	0.84

Notes. The contact scale ranges from 1 to 4, and the scales for multiculturalism, threat and ingroup identification range from 1 to 5. The scale for ingroup feelings ranges from 1 to 100.

** $p < .01$.

contact and low support for multiculturalism, and they perceived moderate levels of threat. The global feeling toward the ingroup was positive and ingroup identification was relatively high. Scores on both measures were significantly above the neutral midpoint of the scales, respectively, $t(594) = 48.07$, and $t(594) = 12.77$, $p_s < .01$.

As in the previous studies, ingroup feelings and identification were significantly related. Furthermore, there were significant associations between outgroup contact and multiculturalism, between contact and threat, and between multiculturalism and threat.

Results: Ingroup Distance

To examine the impact of self-reported contact on ingroup feelings and ingroup identification, and the mediating roles of multiculturalism and threat, two multivariate regression analyses were performed (see Table 6). We did not specify a second classroom level in these analyses, because exact information on classroom clustering was not included.⁵ In addition, we did not include a school level due to the small number of schools.⁶

As shown in Model 1, contact had independent negative effects on ingroup feelings and on identification, and these effects were

equally strong. Multiculturalism and threat were entered as additional predictors in Model 2. As expected, multiculturalism had negative independent effects on ingroup distance. These effects were similar for ingroup feelings and identification. As in the previous studies, contact was positively related to multiculturalism (see Table 5), and the effects of contact were reduced when the influence of multiculturalism was partialled out (Table 6). Thus, we examined the indirect effects of contact on ingroup distance via multiculturalism. Sobel tests revealed that these effects were significant for both ingroup feeling and ingroup identification, respectively, $z = -3.03$ and $z = -3.85$, $p_s < .01$.

Table 6 further shows that higher perceived outgroup threat was associated with stronger ingroup identification and more positive ingroup feelings. In addition, contact was negatively associated with threat and the Sobel test showed that threat mediated the relationship between contact and ingroup identification, $z = 2.28$, and between contact and ingroup feelings, $z = 2.00$, $p_s < .05$.

Results: Alternative Mediation

We have proposed that contact leads to a stronger endorsement of multiculturalism and via multiculturalism to higher ingroup distance. However, alternative relationships are possible and these were tested using structural equation models. We fitted three competing models: the proposed model corresponding to the deprovincialization thesis, an alternative model A in which ingroup

⁵ In the Netherlands, classrooms in secondary schools are less self-contained than in primary school classrooms.

⁶ All analyses were also performed while correcting for between-school differences (i.e., on the standardized residuals following MANOVA). This yielded the same findings.

Table 6. Multilevel Regression Models for the Prediction of Ingroup Distance in Study 3

	Model 1		Model 2	
	Ingroup Feelings	Ingroup Identification	Ingroup Feelings	Ingroup Identification
Contact	-0.18** ^a	-0.22** ^a	-0.09* ^a	-0.09* ^a
Threat	—	—	0.14** ^a	0.21** ^a
Multiculturalism	—	—	-0.16** ^a	-0.22** ^a
Variance				
Level 1 Student	0.97 (3.3 percent)	0.95 (4.7 percent)	0.90 (9.6 percent)	0.83 (17.0 percent)
Deviance		3263.59		3165.33
Model improvement				
χ^2 (<i>df</i>)	36.89 (2)**		98.26 (4)**	
Reference model	Intercept-only		Model 1	

Notes. Regression coefficients are *bs* but all variables are standardized (*z*-scores) at Level 1. For each row in the same model, all effects are similar for ingroup feelings and identification ($p > .05$).

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$

distance mediates the effect of contact on multiculturalism and threat, and an alternative model B in which intergroup contact mediates the effects of multiculturalism and threat on ingroup distance.

We first tested the fit of the deprovincialization model by maximum likelihood assuming multivariate normality. Threat and multiculturalism were the two correlated mediators between intergroup contact and ingroup distance. Ingroup distance was examined as a single latent variable with ingroup identification and ingroup evaluation as indicators. This reduction was warranted because the effects of contact, multiculturalism, and threat were comparable in size for ingroup feelings and ingroup identification (see Table 6). For the other measures, the observed (manifest) scales were used.

The deprovincialization model had a good absolute fit to the data, $\chi^2 = 7.356$; $df = 3$; $\chi^2/df = 2.452$; CFI = .991; GFI = .995; AGFI = 0.976; NFI = 0.985; RMSEA = 0.049 with 90 percent CI = .000–.096. Thus, the proposed model is appropriate for explaining the relationship between the variables. The path model of the full model accounted for 35 percent of the variance in ingroup distance (SMC, squared multiple correlation).

The alternative model A had a good fit as well, $\chi^2 = 13.165$; $df = 4$; $\chi^2/df = 3.291$; CFI = .981; GFI = .991; AGFI = 0.966; NFI = 0.973;

RMSEA = 0.062 with 90 percent CI = .027 – .101. However, the Akaike Information Criterion fit index for this model was higher than that of the original model (AIC = 35.165 vs. 31.356). Thus, the deprovincialization model is superior to the alternative model A (see Kline 2005). In the alternative model B intergroup contact mediated the effects of multiculturalism and threat. This model had a rather poor fit, $\chi^2 = 98.095$; $df = 4$; $\chi^2/df = 24.524$; CFI = .801; GFI = .943; AGFI = 0.785; NFI = 0.797; RMSEA = 0.199 with 90 percent CI = .166 – .234. Moreover, the AIC fit index was relatively high (120.095). Thus, the deprovincialization model was also superior to the alternative model B.

Discussion

The results of Study 3 are similar to the first two studies and further support the deprovincialization thesis. Quantity of intergroup contact is associated with stronger endorsement of multiculturalism which, in turn, is associated with higher ingroup distance. This pattern of mediation was found while taking feelings of outgroup threat statistically into account. Independently of threat, quantity of intergroup contact was related to more distance from the ingroup via a stronger endorsement of the value of cultural diversity. In addition, contact was

related to lower feelings of threat and threat was positively associated with ingroup identification. The relationship between intergroup contact and ingroup distance was also mediated by feelings of outgroup threat.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The research on Allport's (1954) intergroup contact hypothesis is extensive (Brown and Hewstone 2005; Pettigrew and Tropp 2006). Many studies have established that frequent and positive intergroup contact reduces prejudice, and researchers have examined moderators and mediators of this effect. The present research focused on ingroup distance rather than on outgroup evaluations.

Majority group members are generally not inclined to reflect on their ingroup's privileged culture and to think about themselves in terms of ethnic groups (Verkuyten 2005). Contacts with ethnic minorities can lead to more knowledge and appreciation of cultural differences, and more awareness of the self-evident and normative nature of one's own culture. New experiences with people from other ethnic groups and learning about other cultures can help to reduce ethnocentrism. It broadens one's horizon and enriches one's view of the social world. As a consequence, ingroup norms, beliefs, and customs are put into perspective and are reappraised. A new, more pluralist rather than ingroup-centric perspective implies a distancing of oneself from the majority ingroup. Pettigrew (1997, 1998) refers to this process as deprovincialization, but, to our knowledge, there is no systematic empirical evidence for it. Studies on majority groups have found that the endorsement of multiculturalism is related to less positive ingroup evaluations (Verkuyten 2005) and that intergroup contact diminishes the strength of ingroup identification (Pettigrew 1997, 2009). But there is also research that finds no relationship between outgroup contact and ingroup reappraisal (e.g., Eller and Abrams 2004) and there is no research that has tested the deprovincialization thesis more fully by focusing on mediating processes.

By analyzing data from three surveys among native Dutch participants, we examined the prediction that the relationship between quantity of intergroup contact and ingroup distance is mediated by the endorsement of multicultural recognition. Multiculturalism puts ingroup norms and customs into perspective and emphasizes cultural equality. Although somewhat different measures were used, the findings for the three data sets are similar and strongly support the deprovincialization thesis. In Study 1, higher opportunity for interethnic contact was associated with a stronger endorsement of multiculturalism and, in turn, multiculturalism was related to lower ingroup identification and less positive global feelings toward the Dutch ingroup. Study 2 focused on self-reported quantity of contact; the endorsement of multiculturalism was again found to mediate the relationship between contact and ingroup identification and ingroup feelings. In Study 3 we considered the alternative explanation of how feelings of outgroup threat can play a mediating role. It turned out that threat did indeed mediate the relationship between contact and ingroup distance but the endorsement of multiculturalism also was an independent mediator. Independently of threat, multiculturalism provides an ideological view about the importance of cultural diversity to put one's own customs and norms into perspective. This is not only important theoretically, but also in view of trying to develop educational and community relations interventions for reducing ethnocentric worldviews.

Furthermore, it turned out that the effects on ingroup identification were stronger than on ingroup feelings (Studies 1 and 2). Arguably, the former is a better indicator of ingroup distance than the latter (Guimond et al. 2002; Verkuyten and Reijerse 2008). Less positive ingroup feelings might also indicate committed criticism rather than ingroup distance. However, people with low group identification typically tend to dissociate themselves from their ingroup and are more reluctant to think and act in terms of their group membership. In addition to these

indicators, future studies could also examine ingroup distance and reappraisal more directly, for example by asking whether contact with ethnic outgroups has made one think differently about one's own group.

As a whole, the findings of the three studies strongly support the notion that through intergroup contact individuals get a wider perspective that is critical of ingroup values, beliefs, and customs. It should be noted, however, that we have not investigated the long-term deprovincialization effects and also do not know whether there is a spread of the effect to situations outside the school setting and in relation to a variety of ethnic outgroups. It could be that intergroup contact in other settings does not lead to a less ingroup-centric perspective, and that contact with culturally more similar outgroups leads to an emphasis on ingroup norms and customs rather than a "wider perspective" and a self-critical view (Jetten, Postmes, and Spears 2004). In addition, it should be noted that the current focus was on the distancing away from the ingroup. The two quotes heading this article indicate that deprovincialization also implies that "you start taking more of an interest in other cultures too" or that you develop "a less provincial perspective on other groups in general" (Pettigrew 1997:174). Future studies should examine these implications systematically but there is some suggestive evidence for this proposition. For example, research that measures or manipulates multicultural ideology has found multiculturalism to be associated with less explicit and automatic outgroup prejudice (e.g., Richeson and Nussbaum 2004; Velasco Gonzalez et al. 2008; Verkuyten 2005; Wolsko et al. 2000, 2006). Furthermore, forms of multicultural education aim to educate children about ethnic-cultural differences with the idea that increased knowledge and understanding will lead to a greater openness and acceptance of others (Banks and Banks 1995). There is empirical evidence for this supposition in several studies, including in the Netherlands (see Verkuyten 2008; see also Hogan and Mallot 2005; Nagda et al. 2004).

In evaluating the findings some limitations should be discussed. The research is concerned with the situation in the Netherlands, self-reports were used, no objective measure of actual contact was available, the analyses are cross-sectional (allowing no definite conclusions about causality), the focus was on the frequency of contact, and aspects and components of ingroup distance other than group identification and group feelings were not examined. For example, in testing the deprovincialization thesis we focused on the amount of intergroup contact. Contact frequency has been found to be associated with more positive outgroup attitudes (Tausch et al. 2007; Velasco Gonzalez et al. 2008) and to causally lead to more positive attitudes (Brown et al. 2007). Our results show that more frequent contact with ethnic minority members is also related to greater appreciation of cultural diversity and a less ingroup-centric perspective. This result occurred although the level of contact (opportunity) in all three studies was not very high. Future studies should examine other contact situations and also focus on the quality of the contact. Research indicates that quality of contact and outgroup friendships are more effective in reducing prejudice than contact frequency (Pettigrew and Tropp 2006). This could mean that positive contact might be even more effective in stimulating a more nuanced or less provincial perspective on one's ingroup.

Our finding for quantity of contact might in part be the result of the fact that frequency of contact often goes together with more intimate and positive outgroup relations. In Studies 2 and 3, participants were asked to indicate how often they had intergroup contact in situations that were partly self-chosen. Furthermore, it is possible that contact does not lead to the endorsement of multiculturalism, but rather that multicultural individuals tend to have more outgroup contacts (Tropp and Bianchi 2006). However, this reversed causal sequence is highly unlikely in Study 1, which focused on the opportunity of contact, and in Studies 2 and 3 the model in which the causal order was reversed provided

a poor fit. In addition, the model based on the deprovincialization thesis engaged the associations in the data better than a model in which ingroup distance mediated the association between contact frequency and the endorsement of multiculturalism (Studies 2 and 3). Thus, the empirical evidence is most in support of the deprovincialization thesis. However, the testing of alternative statistical models does not provide conclusive evidence about causality and a further test of this thesis should be based on longitudinal or experimental studies.

Future studies could also examine deprovincialization by focusing on other constructs and measures, in addition to multiculturalism. For example, it would be interesting to examine ethnocentrism or ingroup-centrism and not only the endorsement of multicultural recognition. Multiculturalism provides a general ideological view that puts the cultural identity of the majority group into perspective. It emphasizes equality between and respect for the pluralism of cultures and group identities. However, it should be noted that majority groups can also perceive multiculturalism as ingroup threatening (Verkuyten 2006). This means that the endorsement of multiculturalism might not always be the best way for stimulating a less ingroup-centric perspective.

Furthermore, it might be argued that distancing away from the ingroup can also have negative consequences, for example, for psychological well-being and for social solidarity. This seems less likely, however, for majority than for minority groups. Compared to minorities, majority group members are generally less inclined to reflect on their ingroup's privileged position and culture (Verkuyten 2005). As a result, ethnic outgroup contact can lead to more knowledge and appreciation of cultural differences and a heightened awareness of the normative status of one's own culture. This is especially likely in non-settler societies like the Netherlands and Germany that have a historically established native majority group and that do not consider cultural diversity as an intrinsic or self-defining part of their nation. Furthermore, in these countries the representations

of nationhood and of the native population tend to correspond: Dutch typically means ethnic Dutch, and German means ethnic German. This means that for these majority group members ingroup reappraisal is probably more viable for improving intergroup relations than a dual identity representation in which ethnic identities and a common national identity are emphasized simultaneously (Dovidio, Gaertner, and Saguy 2007).

In contrast, most minority group members are well aware of their group's devaluation and they are familiar with the culture of the majority group. Furthermore, ethnic minorities tend to emphasize their dual identity as members of their ethnic group and of the common national category (Dovidio et al. 2007). This makes it less likely that intergroup contact leads to a reappraisal of their ingroup and to more ingroup distance. In their meta-review, Tropp and Pettigrew (2005) found that the relationship between contact and prejudice tends to be weaker among minority groups than among majority groups. Future studies should examine the deprovincialization thesis among ethnic minority members.

To conclude, the strength of our research is the successful attempt to cross-validate the deprovincialization thesis in three independent majority samples. The findings provide strong support for the proposition that the amount of intergroup contact helps to make ingroup cultural standards relative rather than invariant and self-evident. Contact can stimulate reflecting on one's own group and a more critical ingroup orientation. A wider perspective that goes beyond "this conventional, narrow Holland" is the result and gaining distance from the dominant majority group helps to form a less provincial view of ethnic outgroups.

REFERENCES

- Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Arends-Tóth, Judith and Fons Van de Vijver. 2003. "Multiculturalism and Acculturation: Views of Dutch and Turkish-Dutch." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 33:249–66.

- Banks, James A. and Cherry M. Banks. 1995. *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Baron, Reuben M. and David A. Kenny. 1986. "The Moderator-mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51:1173–82.
- Berry, John W. and Rudolf Kalin. 1995. "Multicultural and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada: An Overview of the 1991 National Survey." *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Sciences* 27:301–20.
- Blalock, Hubert M. 1967. *Toward a Theory of Minority Group Relations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Brown, Rupert, Anja Eller, Sarah Leeds, and Kim Stace. 2007. "Intergroup Contact and Intergroup Attitudes: A Longitudinal Study." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 37:692–703.
- Brown, Rupert and Miles Hewstone. 2005. "An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Contact." Pp 255–343 in *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 37, edited by Mark Zanna. San Diego, CA: Elsevier.
- Dovidio, John F., Samuel L. Gaertner, and Tamar Saguy. 2007. "Another View of 'We' Majority and Minority Group Perspectives on a Common Ingroup Identity." *European Review of Social Psychology* 18:296–330.
- Eccleston, Colette P. and Brenda N. Major. 2006. "Attributions to Discrimination and Self-esteem: The Role of Group Identification and Appraisal." *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* 9:147–62.
- Eller, Anja and Dominic Abrams. 2004. "Come Together: Longitudinal Comparisons of Pettigrew's Reformulated Intergroup Contact Model and the Common Ingroup Identity Model in Anglo-French and Mexican-American Contexts." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 34:229–56.
- Esses, Victoria M., Lynne M. Jackson, John F. Dovidio, and Gordon Hodson. 2005. "Instrumental Relations among Groups: Group Competition, Conflict and Prejudice." Pp. 227–43 in *On the Nature of Prejudice: Fifty Years after Allport*, edited by John F. Dovidio, Peter Glick, and Lauri A. Rudman. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Fowers, Blaine J. and Frank C. Richardson. 1996. "Why Is Multiculturalism Good?" *American Psychologist* 51:609–21.
- Fredrickson, George M. 1999. "Models of American Ethnic Relations: A Historical Perspective." Pp. 23–34 in *Cultural Divides: Understanding and Overcoming Group Conflict*, edited by Deborah A. Prentice and Dale T. Miller. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Goldstein, Harvey. 1995. *Multilevel Statistical Models*. London, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Guimond, Serge, Stephane Dif, and Annabelle Aupy. 2002. "Social Identity, Relative Group Status, and Intergroup Attitudes: When Favorable Outcomes Change Intergroup Relations ... for the Worse." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 32:739–60.
- Hallinan, Maureen T. and Stevens S. Smith. 1985. "The Effects of Classroom Racial Composition on Students' Interracial Friendliness." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 48:3–16.
- . 1989. "Classroom Characteristics and Students Friendship Cliques." *Social Forces* 67: 898–919.
- Hogan, David E. and Michael Mallott. 2005. "Changing Racial Prejudice through Diversity Education." *Journal of College Student Development* 46:115–25.
- Jetten, Jolanda, Nyla R. Branscombe, Michael T. Schmitt, and Russel Spears. 2001. "Rebel with a Cause: Group Identification as a Response to Perceived Discrimination from the Mainstream." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 27:1204–13.
- Jetten, Jolanda, Tom Postmes, and Russel Spears. 2004. "Intergroup Distinctiveness and Differentiation: A Meta-analytic Integration." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 86:826–79.
- Kline, Rex B. 2005. *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modelling* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- Lancaster, Brian P. 1999. "Defining and Interpreting Suppressor Effects: Advantages and Limitations." Pp. 139–48 in *Advances in Social Science Methodology*, edited by Bruce Thompson. Stanford, CT: JAI Press.
- LeVine, Robert A. and Donald T. Campbell. 1972. *Ethnocentrism*. New York: John Wiley.
- MacKinnon, David P., Ghulam Warsi, and James H. Dwyer. 1995. "A Simulation Study of Mediated Effect Measures." *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 30:41–62.
- Nagda, Biren A., Chan-woo Kim, and Yaffa Truelove. 2004. "Learning about Difference, Learning with Others, Learning to Transgress." *Journal of Social Issues* 60:195–214.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. 1997. "Generalized Intergroup Contact Effects on Prejudice." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 23:173–185.
- . 1998. "Intergroup Contact Theory." *Annual Review Psychology* 49:65–85.
- . 2009. "Secondary Transfer Effect of Contact: Do Intergroup Contact Effects Spread to Noncontacted Outgroups?" *Social Psychology* 40:55–65.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. and Linda Tropp. 2006. "A Meta-analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 90:751–83.
- . 2008. "How does Intergroup Contact Reduce Prejudice? Meta-analytic Tests of Three

- Mediators." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 38:922–34.
- Pew Research Centre. 2005. "Islamic Extremism: Common Concern for Muslim and Western Publics." *The Pew Global Attitudes Project*. Retrieved April 23, 2009 (<http://pewglobal.org/reports/display.php?ReportID=248>).
- Rasbash, Jon R., William Browne, Michael Healy, Bruce Cameron, and Christopher Charlton. 2004. *MLwiN Version 2.0*. New York: Multilevel Models Project Institute of Education.
- Richeson, Jennifer A. and Richard J. Nussbaum. 2004. "The Impact of Multiculturalism Versus Color-blindness on Racial Bias." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 40:417–23.
- Scroggins, Deborah. 2005. "The Dutch-Muslim Cultural War." *The Nation*, June 27, pp.21–25.
- Schmitt, Michael T. and Nyla R. Branscombe. 2002. "Meaning and Consequences of Perceived Discrimination in Advantaged and Privileged Social Groups." Pp. 167–99 in *European Review of Social Psychology*, edited by Wolfgang Stroebe and Miles Hewstone. London, UK: Wiley.
- Snijders, Tom A. B. and Roel J. Bosker. 1999. *Multi-level Analysis. An Introduction to Basic and Advanced Multilevel Modeling*. London, UK: Sage.
- Stephan, Walter G., Oscar Ybarra, Carmen Martinez Martinez, Joseph Schwarzwald, and Michal Turkaspa. 1998. "Prejudice toward Immigrants to Spain and Israel: Integrated Threat Theory Analysis." *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology* 29:559–76.
- Stephan, Walter G., Oscar Ybarra, and G. Bachman. 1999. "Prejudice toward Immigrants: An Integrated Threat Theory." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 29:2221–37.
- Tausch, Nicole, Tania Tam, Miles Hewstone, Jared Kenworthy, and Ed Cairns. 2007. "Individual-level and Group-level Mediators of Contact Effects in Northern Ireland: The Moderating Role of Social Identification." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 46:541–56.
- Tropp, Linda R. and Rebecca A. Bianchi. 2006. "Valuing Diversity and Interest in Intergroup Contact." *Journal of Social Issues* 62:533–51.
- Tropp, Linda R. and Thomas F. Pettigrew. 2005. "Relationships between Intergroup Contact and Prejudice among Minority and Majority Status Groups." *Psychological Science* 16:951–57.
- Tropp, Linda R. and Mary A. Prenevost. 2008. "The Role of Intergroup Contact in Predicting Children's Interethnic Attitudes: Evidence from Meta-analytic and Field Studies." Pp. 236–48 in *Intergroup Attitudes and Relations in Childhood Through Adulthood*, edited by Sheri R. Levy and Melanie Killen. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Velasco González, Karina, Maykel Verkuyten, Jeroen Weesie, and Edwin Poppe. 2008. "Prejudice towards Muslims in the Netherlands: Testing Integrated Threat Theory." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 47:667–85.
- Verkuyten, Maykel. 2004. "Everyday Ways of Thinking about Multiculturalism." *Ethnicities* 4:53–74.
- . 2005. *The Social Psychology of Ethnic identity*. Hove, East Sussex: Psychology Press.
- . 2006. "Multicultural Recognition and Ethnic Minority Rights: A Social Identity Perspective." Pp. 148–84 in *European Review of Social Psychology* (vol. 17), edited by Wolfgang Stroebe and Miles Hewstone. London, UK: Psychology Press.
- . 2008. "Multiculturalism and Group Evaluations among Minority and Majority Groups." Pp. 157–72 in *Intergroup Attitudes and Relations in Childhood through Adulthood*, edited by Sheri R. Levy and Melanie Killen. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Verkuyten, Maykel and Arjan Reijerse. 2008. "Intergroup Structure and Identity Management among Ethnic Minority and Majority groups: The Interactive Effects of Perceived Stability, Legitimacy and Permeability." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 31:106–121.
- Verkuyten, Maykel and Jochem Thijs. 2010. "Religious Group Relations among Christian, Muslim and Nonreligious Early Adolescents in the Netherlands." *The Journal of Early Adolescence* 30: 27–49.
- Verkuyten, Maykel and Kasia Zaremba. 2005. "Interethnic Relations in a Changing Political Context." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68:375–86.
- Voci, Alberto and Miles Hewstone. 2003. "Intergroup Contact and Prejudice toward Immigrants in Italy: The Mediation Role of Anxiety and the Moderational Role of Salience." *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* 6:37–54.
- Wagner, Ulrich, Rolf van Dick, Thomas F. Pettigrew, and Oliver Christ. 2003. "Ethnic Prejudice in East and West Germany: The Explanatory Power of Intergroup Contact." *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* 6:22–36.
- Ward, Colleen and Anne-Marie Masgoret. 2006. "An Integrative Model of Attitudes toward Immigrants." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 30:671–82.
- Wolsko, Christopher, Bernadette Park, and Charles M. Judd. 2006. "Considering the Tower of Babel: Correlates of Assimilation and Multiculturalism among Ethnic Minority and Majority Groups in the United States." *Social Justice Research* 19:277–306.
- Wolsko, Christopher, Bernadette Park, Charles M. Judd, and Bernd Wittenbrink. 2000. "Framing Interethnic Ideology: Effects of Multicultural and Color-blind Perspectives on Judgements of Groups and Individuals." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 78:635–54.

Maykel Verkuyten is a professor at the department of interdisciplinary social science and academic director of the European Research Center on Migration and Ethnic Relations (ERCOMER) at Utrecht University in the Netherlands. His main research interest is in ethnic identity and interethnic relations.

Jochem Thijs is an assistant professor at the department of interdisciplinary social science and a researcher at ERCOMER at Utrecht University in the Netherlands. His research interest is in discrimination, victimization, and educational adjustments, particularly of ethnic minority children and adolescents.

Hide Bekhuis is PhD student at ERCOMER at the Utrecht University in the Netherlands. He is writing a dissertation on national cultural consumption. Besides national cultural consumption he studies xenophobic attitudes and the influence of interethnic contact on interethnic relations.